DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 065 521 TM 001 441

AUTHOR	Chaples, Ernest A.; And Others
TITLE	Measuring Prejudicial Attitudes in a Situational Context: A Report on a Danish Experiment.
INSTITUTION	Maryland Univ., College Park. Cultural Study Center.
REPORT NO	RR-9-71
PUB DATE	71
NOTE	20p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Attitude Tests; Caucasians; College Students; Foreign Workers; *Measurement Instruments; Negroes; *Racial Attitudes; *Situational Tests; Social Attitudes; *Student Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS	SAS; *Situational Attitude Scale

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to examine the attitudes of white Danish university students toward blacks and Mediterranean foreign workers. The Situational Attitude Scale (SAS) was translated into Danish Forms A (no reference to race), B (black) and C (Mediterranean foreign worker) and administered to 274 white students at Copenhagen and Aarhus Universities. Results of analyses of variance and Sheffe post hcc comparisons indicated that white Danes were consistently pro-black but had strong negative feelings toward Mediterranean foreign workers. In fact, Danes viewed Mediterranean foreign workers much as whites from the United States view blacks. The implications for public policy in Denmark are discussed, as is the appropriateness of the SAS methodology in assessing racial and ethnic attitudes across cultures. (Author/DB)

ED 065521

CULTURAL STUDY CENTER

Office of Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

College Park, Maryland

CG 01 441

ED 065521

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CULTURAL STUDY CENTER
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND
COLLEGE PARK, MARYLAND

1971

MEASURING PREJUDICIAL ATTITUDES IN A SITUATIONAL CONTEXT: A REPORT ON A DANISH EXPERIMENT

Ernest A. Chaples, William E. Sedlacek
and Glenwood C. Brooks, Jr.

Research Report # 9-71

CULTURAL STUDY CENTER

MEASURING PREJUDICIAL ATTITUDES IN A SITUATIONAL CONTEXT: A REPORT ON A DANISH EXPERIMENT

Ernest A. Chaples, William E. Sedlacek and Glenwood C. Brooks, Jr.

Research Report # 9-71

SUMMARY

A number of studies have recently been conducted on racial attitudes in the United States. Despite the longstanding problems which cultural minorities have faced in many European countries, comparable work on the nature of group prejudice has not developed in Europe. In an era in which immigration restrictions seem to be lessening considerably and when economic pressures to increase the flow of cheap labor into many Northern European countries are growing, the public policy implications of societal attitudes toward minority populations would appear to be increasingly relevant.

The purpose of this study was to examine the attitudes of white Danish university students toward blacks and Mediterranean foreign workers ("sydlandsk fremmedarbejder"). The Situational Attitude Scale (SAS) was translated into Danish Forms A (no reference to race), B (black) and C (Mediterranean foreign worker) and administered to 274 white students at Copenhagen and Aarhus Universities. Results of analyses of variance and Sheffé post hoc comparisons indicated that white Danes were consistently pro-black but had strong negative feelings toward Mediterranean foreign workers. In fact, Danes viewed Mediterranean foreign workers much as whites from the United States view blacks.

The implications for public policy in Denmark were discussed as was the appropriateness of the SAS methodology in assessing racial and ethnic attitudes across cultures.

A very substantial literature has developed in recent years on the nature of prejudicial attitudes in the United States. This interest in prejudicial attitudes, particularly on questions of race prejudice, is understandable in view of the continued existence of race relations as a major social problem in the United States.

Despite the longstanding problems which cultural minorities have faced in many European countries, comparable work on the nature of group prejudice has not developed in Europe. In an era in which immigration restrictions seem to be lessening considerably and when economic pressures to increase the flow of cheap labor into many Northern European countries are growing, the public policy implications of societal attitudes toward minority populations would appear to be increasingly relevant. The Scandinavian nations have tended to view racial tensions in the United States, South Africa, and more recently in Great Britain, in a critical and yet removed manner.(1) Yet little is known about how Scandinavian citizens themselves feel about "outgroups" and how they might be expected to respond to social situations involving non-Nordic minorities.

Methods of Measuring Prejudicial Attitudes

A number of studies of prejudicial attitudes, particularly attitudes of whites toward blacks, have been undertaken in recent years.(2) Most of these studies have been based on the development of appropriate attitude scales for assessing the attitudes of one group toward another. A number of problems exist with such scales, however, that make it difficult to use them with any degree of confidence to measure attitudes among groups in either Europe or the United States. First of all, such attitudinal measures must be kept contemporary to be useful, and many of the best known devices are outdated. Secondly, there is little evidence to support claims of scale validity for many of the most commonly used racial attitude scales. Since the validity of these measures is

questionable when they are used in an American cultural setting, it would seem to be an even more critical problem when such instruments are used in a non-American setting. A third problem in using most of the standard attitude scales that measure prejudice is that among certain groups, particularly university students, there is considerable social reinforcement for being "tolerant" toward minority groups, particularly toward blacks.(3) Since the purpose of many of these measures is often readily apparent, the difficulty in collecting accurate data is substantial when prejudice is a commodity to be hidden from one's peers.

One of the most often cited studies of prejudicial attitudes in recent years, carried out by Rokeach, Smith and Evans,(4) suggests that belief congruence rather than race prejudice is largely responsible for the behavior of majority groups toward cultural and racial minorities. Earlier studies with American college students by Sedlacek and Brooks suggest that this is not the case.(5) This work suggests the purpose of Rokeach's instrument is too obvious to most respondents and that many respondents, therefore, psychologically withdraw from this questionnaire and ignore the racial variable. As a result of this withdrawal, beliefs are measured out of context and the results display a clear lack of attention to race.

To meet the set of problems enumerated above, Sedlacek and Brooks have designed an approach to the study of prejudicial attitudes which would reduce or eliminate these methodological problems. Their studies among American university students to date suggest that this new approach can be viewed as a substantial improvement in accurately measuring prejudicial attitudes.(6)

The Situational Attitude Scale

The Situational Attitude Scale (SAS) was developed to measure the degree of prejudicial attitudes which one group holds for another. Initially, the SAS was used to study the attitudes of whites toward blacks in the United States.

To provide a prejudicial context and make withdrawal from the instrument difficult, ten personal and social situations, with some relevance to a racial response, were created (see Table 1).

These situations represent instances where the prejudicial attitudes of one group toward another group might be relevant to one's attitude about the situation involved. For each situation, 10 bipolar semantic differential scales were written,(7) making a total of 100 items in the SAS (see Table 2 for items). For use with American subjects, two forms of the SAS were developed. Each form contained the same situations, bipolar scales and instructions except that the word "black" was inserted into each situation in Form B.(8) The positive pole for each item was varied randomly from right to left to avoid response set.

For use with Danish university students, Forms A and B were translated into Danish in as nearly a verbatum manner as possible.(9) In addition, a Form C was developed to measure prejudicial attitudes toward Mediterranean foreign workers ("sydlandsk fremmedarbejder"). It was generally the opinion of a group of Danish students and teachers consulted on this question that the "sydlandsk fremmedarbejder" represents the most direct "outgroup" threat to Danes at the present time.(10) While the number of blacks ("negers") remains very small in Denmark and black-white relations are therefore truly a problem for other countries, the number of Mediterranean foreign workers in Denmark has increased rapidly in recent years. Their presence in Denmark has been established and may well increase substantially in the next decade if the need for cheap unskilled labor in Denmark continues to grow.

The Experimental Group

The three forms of the SAS were administered to 306 students at Copenhagen and Aarhus Universities during regularly scheduled class meetings in nine different classes. The questionnaires were completed anonymously. A total of 32

questionnaires were not included in the analysis because these respondents either left more than 10 items blank or indicated their unwillingness to participate in the experiment. The median scale value (scale 0 to 4; 2=median) was assigned to any missing item responses, providing there were 10 items or less blank on a questionnaire. The final usable *N* was 274; 94 Form A's, 90 Form B's, and 90 Form C's.

Advanced political science students, who were trained in the use of the SAS and participants in its preparation for use in Denmark, administered the SAS.[11] The questionnaires were randomly distributed in each class with each participant having an approximately equal chance of receiving any of the three forms. The participants in the experiment were not aware that different forms of the questionnaire existed. If participants had questions, they were handled on an individual basis so as not to disturb other participants or accidentally expose the fact that different forms of the questionnaire were being used. Administration of the instrument required 20 to 30 minutes.

The characteristics of the participants completing the three forms were very similar. There were 223 male and 51 female participants. The participants were drawn from a number of different institutes in both universities including architecture, biology, education, english, history, law, mathematics, philosophy, political science and psychology. The participants included students from both introductory and advanced classes, and represented a diverse cross-section of Danish university students.[12]

An analysis of variance with form (A,B or C) and school (Aarhus or Copenhagen) as main effects was conducted. The results of this analysis indicated that 46 items were statistically significant (.05 level) for form while 7 items of 100 were significant for school and 9 items for form by school. Since, according to Sakoda, Cohen and Beall,[13] 9 items out of 100 would be significant by chance, we can conclude that responses varied depending on whether Form A, B, or C was

used, but that there were no differences between Copenhagen and Aarhus students or between combinations of form and school.(14)

Study Results

Table 2 shows the results when *F* values are computed for each combination of forms used in this experiment. First results for Form A and Form B are compared. This allows us to measure the degree of difference which results from the insertion of the concept of black ("neger") in the social situations used in the SAS. When this is done, 32 of the 100 items show significant differences between the forms.(15) Since we could expect only nine tests in a hundred to be significant by chance, these results suggest that the data for Form B deserve further analysis.(16) When the post hoc results for Forms A and C are compared to measure the effects of the "sydlandsk fremmedarbejder," 26 of the items show significant differences between the forms.

In order to measure any congruence between the attitudes displayed toward the two outgroups (B and C), *F* values were also computed for Forms B and C. While the SAS methodology provides us with a reference or norm group for each experimental group (the respondents to Form A), comparisons between Forms B and C may provide us with further evidence on the types of social situations which elicit similar response patterns among our participants who answered Forms B and C and the types of situations which result in basically different responses. When Forms B and C are compared here, 15 situations elicit significantly different responses. Ten of these fifteen differences are found to occur in situations I (family moves next door) and V (friend becomes engaged).

There is no empirical evidence produced by the SAS as to the positivity or negativity of either item pole. If goodness or badness is ascribed to either pole on the basis of the social desirability of the dimension involved, however, the significant mean differences within each situation are consistent. For

example, if we examine the ten items used in situation III (man selling magazines), we find that the insertion of either "neger" or "sydlandsk fremmedarbejder" into the situation leads the respondents to feel more positive toward the situation than is true if no group identification is provided (Form A). Form B means are consistently more positive (pro-black) for situations I, III, IV, V, VI, VII, VIII, and IX. These results are in sharp contrast to the findings for American students on Form B where results were overwhelmingly anti-black for eight of the ten situations.(17) What the Danish students are revealing here is a substantial and consistent pro-black orientation in their attitude patterns. Like their American counterparts, they approve of blacks in situations involving minimal social contact such as having blacks sell magazines or serve as policemen. But unlike American students they also indicate a substantial bias in favor of blacks for the situations which represent the most intimate types of social contact between individuals. Danish students would rather have their friend become engaged to a "neger," they would rather have a "neger" join their social group and they would prefer having a "neger" move in next door to them. They are also less frightened by the loitering men when they are blacks, less disturbed by the youngster who steals when he is black, and more positively disposed toward the campus demonstration when blacks are the demonstrators. Only the situations involving rape and a person standing on the bus find no significant bias in favor of blacks over plain everyday Danes.

When the comparisons between Forms A and C are examined, a substantially different attitude pattern emerges toward the Mediterranean foreign worker. Danish students are positively disposed to Mediterranean foreign workers selling magazines or serving as policemen. They also exhibit less fear of the idea of foreign workers loitering on the corner than they do when just any five young men are loitering there and they adopt a more passive stance toward the child of a foreign worker who steals in a dimestore. When it comes to those social

situations which exhibit a substantial degree of intimacy, however, negative attitudes comparable to those among American students toward blacks surface quite clearly. When their friend becomes engaged to a "sydlandsk fremmedarbejder," they are significantly more aggressive, more sad, more angered, and more disgusted by the situation. The evidence on the situations involving the new neighbor (situation I) and the person joining their social group (situation VII) is less dramatic than with the engagement situation, but the results again lean significantly toward the negative pole when the Mediterranean worker is included in the situation. When comparisons between Forms B and C are made, the more negative attitudes toward the Mediterranean foreign worker compared to the blacks are even more evident. The results for situation IX also show a negative attitude toward the Mediterranean student demonstration. While a black student demonstration is judged to be more serious than a regular demonstration with students indicating more trust in the blacks and a feeling of being less disturbed by them, the Mediterranean students' demonstration would be judged comparatively both wrong and unjustified.

Discussion and Interpretation

At a time when serious questions are being raised about the nature of foreign immigration into Denmark, the preliminary results of this study deserve further examination. The Danes have generally been considered a very tolerant and accepting people. Their abhorrence of racial prejudice in the United States, South Africa, and Britain is understandable and admirable. This study shows that Danish students have developed a highly sympathetic and idealized image of black people. But one finds only a handful of blacks living in Denmark at present, and such an attitude set must be attributed, at least in part, to the widespread attention which prejudice and discrimination toward blacks in other countries has received in Denmark.[18]

The influx of Mediterranean peoples into Denmark is a fairly recent phenonemon. Danish immigration policy allows such immigration only to fill jobs which Danes themselves do not desire. This supply of Turks, Yugoslavs, Italians and Greeks provides Denmark with a significant portion of its unskilled labor in its low status occupations today. Membership in the Common Market and general economic expansion are likely to increase these pressures. Yet these very preliminary results from what may well be one of Denmark's most "progressive" social groups -- its students[19] -- suggest that the roots for substantial group conflict are definitely present in Denmark. Denmark remains one of the most homogeneous societies among the more developed nations. The nation has had its problems with a German minority along its southern border and has chosen to have that minority substantially reduced in numbers following World War II by voluntarily withdrawing territorial claims to large portions of Slesvig and Holstein.[20]

While preliminary results from a pilot study of 274 Danish university students cannot be used as a basis for policy decisions, the results here suggest that policy concerning the "sydlandsk fremmedarbejeter" could prove crucial to Danish society in the decades to come. It cannot be assumed that mere goodwill and a lack of serious tension at present will prevent difficulties in the future. The study of other cultures suggests that mere social contact will not guarantee either peace or understanding among hostile groups once an "outgroup" is established within a society.[21] Such hostility may be in the process of developing in Denmark at present. Even when outgroups enter a society in an equal status capacity, the avoidance of prejudiced attitudes and hostile group attitudes is difficult. In Denmark, the "fremmedarbejder" almost always enter the country in an inferior status capacity.

In an important summary of the research on the effects of contact between ethnic and racial groups, Amir[22] concludes that unless contact takes place

under favorable conditions it is likely to result in increased intergroup tension and prejudice. Unfavorable conditions include differential status capacities.

This study has definite and obvious limitations. It has been restricted to a limited number of university students. It has attempted to use a methodology developed for measuring American race prejudice and to adapt that instrument to measure a broader range of prejudicial attitudes than was measured in the United States. As a result, some of the situations in the SAS may be less relevant to Denmark and some of the semantic differential pairs have proved awkward in their translation into Danish.

Despite these limitations, the implications of the results reported here bear further examination, and further research on these questions would seem justified. Denmark is a consensus-oriented society with a social and political system which minimizes overt conflict among the ruling elites and within the society as a whole. If substantial Mediterranean immigration into Denmark is to continue, programs for strengthening the "Danish-ness" of immigrants may well be in order. The further education of Danes concerning the norms and cultures of the immigrant groups would also seem to be worth consideration.[23] Planning for such programs now before overt hostilities among Danes and outgroups become serious could prevent substantial minority conflict in Denmark in the decades ahead.

NOTES

1. An indication of the Danish attitude toward the American racial problem can be seen in the results of a United States Information Agency study of 1957. In this poll 82% of the Danish respondents indicated they thought the treatment of Negroes in the U.S. was "very bad." Results reported in Hazel Erskine, "The Polls: World Opinion of U.S. Racial Problems," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 32 (Summer, 1968), p.302.

2. See for example E. Q. Campbell, "Some Social Psychological Correlations of Direction of Attitude Change," *Social Forces*, 36 (1958), pp. 335-340; J. M. Fendrich, "A Study of the Association Among Attitudes, Commitment and Overt Behavior in Different Experimental Situations," *Social Forces*, 45 (1967), pp 347-355; and H. C. Triandis, "Exploratory Factor Analysis of the Behavioral Component of Social Attitudes," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 68 (1964), pp. 420-436.

3. See for instance H. Schuman and J. Harding, "Sympathetic Identification with the Underdog," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 27 (1963), pp. 230-241; H. Sigall and R. Page, "Two Looks at Stereotypes," *American Psychological Association Proceedings*, 5 (1970), pp. 355-356; and W. E. Sedlacek and G. C. Brooks, Jr., "Social Acceptability in the Measurement of Racial Attitudes," *Psychological Reports*, 29 (1971), pp. 17-18.

4. M. Rokeach, P. Smith and R. Evans, "Two Kinds of Prejudice or One?" in M. Rokeach, *The Open and Closed Mind*, New York: Basic Books, 1960, pp. 132-168.

5. See W. E. Sedlacek and G. C. Brooks, Jr., "Measuring Racial Attitudes in a Situational Context," *Psychological Reports*, 27 (1970), pp. 971-980 and Sedlacek and Brooks, "The Measurement of Attitudes of Whites Toward Blacks with Certain Beliefs," *Cultural Study Center Research Report # 7-70*, 1970, College Park: University of Maryland.

6. See the Sedlacek and Brooks studies cited in previous notes for reports on the application of their approach to American student groups.

7. C. E. Osgood, G. Suci, and P. A. Tannenbaum, *The Measurement of Meaning*, Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1957.

8. Study by Brooks and Sedlacek shows that the specific prejudiced referent used has no effect in determining responses. See Brooks and Sedlacek, "Choice of Racial Referent as a Variable in Racial Attitude Measurement," *Cultural Study Center Research Report # 5-71*, 1971, College Park: University of Maryland.

9. The authors wish to thank Georg Ginsberg, Tyge Jantzen, and Svend-Aage Mortensen for their assistance in preparing the Danish instruments, and in collecting and coding the data. The project could not have been accomplished without their interest and hard work. Copies of the Danish instruments are available from the authors on request.

10. The "sydlandsk fremmedarbejder" hypothesis represents the collective thoughts of an empirical methods preseminar at the University of Copenhagen during the spring of 1971, which was taught by the senior author while he was a Fulbright-Hays lecturer at that institution.

11. In Aarhus the questionnaires were distributed by teachers in the Institut of Statskudskab under the direction of P. Nannestad Olsen. Administrators at Aarhus were fully aware of the purposes of the questionnaires and were following the same instructions that were followed in Copenhagen.

12. In seeking a heterogeneous group of this type, we were attempting to replicate the Maryland population originally discussed by Sedlacek and Brooks, *op.cit.*, *Psychological Reports*, 1970. Students in their first two years at the University are overrepresented in the present study and students from instituts in the faculty of economics and law constitute a total of 68% of all the participants in the study. Previous work by Sedlacek and Brooks suggests that this is not likely to be of any consequence and other analyses of the present data indicate that there are no significant differences among the respondents according to their field or length of study.

13. J. M. Sakoda, G. H. Cohen, and G. Beall, "Tests of Significance for a Series of Statistical Tests," *Psychological Bulletin* 51 (1954), pp. 172-175.

14. The items which were statistically significant between the Copenhagen and Aarhus participants were as follows: 11,12,13,14,18,25 and 95. Five of the seven items are clustered on situation II where Aarhus respondents were significantly more "disgusted by," "repulsed by," "saddened by," "hostile toward," etc. the rape situation than were Copenhagen students. Complete analysis of variance results are available from the authors on request.

15. In an attempt to identify the source of the differences between Forms A, B, and C, a post hoc comparison, using a method developed by Sheffé, was undertaken. The Sheffé method tells us the number of item differences when comparing Forms A versus B, B versus C, and A versus C. Sheffé's test is conservative in that it requires relatively large differences between item means for significance. Because of the conservative nature of the test, a .10 level of significance is used in all post hoc comparisons as recommended by Sheffé. See H. T. Sheffé, *The Analysis of Variance*, New York: George Wiley and Sons, 1959.

16. By comparison, the results for the original University of Maryland experimental group showed 55 items out of 100 to be significant, using the less conservative 2-tailed t test at the .05 level.

17. See Sedlacek and Brooks, *op.cit.*, *Psychological Reports*, 1970. The two situations where the American students were not anti-black were situations III and VI.

18. Actually, a less kind interpretation of the Form B results could also be suggested here. Danish students quite clearly define "negers" as an "outgroup." If they did not, the number of statistically significant responses to Form B would be much smaller. It is quite possible that a type of "reverse prejudice" or racial paternalism is being revealed here. If this is the case, the introduction of a larger black population in Denmark could possibly lead Denmark down a path similar to the one being followed in Britain and in certain areas of the northern United States where overt racial prejudices among the white population seem to be growing by alarming proportions. Since the situation remains hypothetical, it is very difficult to predict whether Denmark represents a potential utopia for blacks or simply another potential pit of white racism.

19. Several studies of American prejudice suggest that in the American culture, at least, prejudice is least evident among the highly educated, among unmarried people, and among those who are "social participators." On all these criteria, students would be potentially among the least prejudiced groups in a society. See, for example, Robin M. Williams, Jr., *Strangers Next Door*, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1964, pp. 274-276.

20. A brief discussion of the German minority problem can be found in Kenneth E. Miller, *Government and Politics in Denmark*, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1968, pp. 29-34 and 48-50. Miller also maintains that strengthening the "Danish-ness" of the German border territory has been a policy of Denmark's right wing Conservative and Independent Parties in the post World War II era.

21. See for example Williams, *op.cit.*, pp. 296-298.

22. Yehuda Amir, "Contact Hypothesis in Ethnic Relations," *Psychological Bulletin* 71, 1969, pp. 319-342.

23. There is overwhelming evidence to suggest that education and aculturation programs lose much of their potential effect once overt group differences develop. See, for example, the work of Muzafer Sherif, *The Psychology of Social Norms*, New York: Harper and Brothers, 1936. A recent five nation study of interpersonal conflict, which includes Denmark and Sweden, concludes that there is far more involved in resolving conflict than good will. The study finds that limitations in man's ability to process information often prevents him from solving problems in a rational manner. See Berndt Brehmer, *et.al.*, "A Cross-National Comparison of Cognitive Conflict," *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* 1 (1970), pp. 5-20.

TABLE 1

Instructions and Situations from the Situational Attitude Scale*

INSTRUCTIONS

This questionnaire measures how people think and feel about a number of social and personal incidents and situations. It is not a test so there are no right or wrong answers. The questionnaire is anonymous so please DO NOT SIGN YOUR NAME.

Each item or situation is followed by 10 descriptive word scales. Your task is to select, for each descriptive scale, the rating which best describes YOUR feelings toward the item.

Sample item: Going out on a date

happy A B C D E sad

You would indicate the direction and extent of your feelings (e.g., you might select B) by indicating your choice (B) on your response sheet by blackening in the appropriate space for that word scale. DO NOT MARK ON THE BOOKLET. PLEASE RESPOND TO ALL WORD SCALES.

Sometimes you may feel as though you had the same item before on the questionnaire. This will not be the case, so DO NOT LOOK BACK AND FORTH through the items. Do not try to remember how you checked similar items earlier in the questionnaire. MAKE EACH ITEM A SEPARATE AND INDEPENDENT JUDGMENT. Respond as honestly as possible without puzzling over individual items. Respond with your first impressions whenever possible.

SITUATIONS

Form A	Form B	Form C
I. A new family moves in next door to you.	A new black family moves in next door to you.	A new Mediterranean foreign worker's family moves in next door to you.
II. You read in the paper that a man has raped a woman.	You read in the paper that a black man has raped a white woman.	You read in the paper that a Mediterranean foreign worker has raped a woman.
III. It is evening and a man appears at your door saying he is selling magazines.	It is evening and a black man appears at your door saying he is selling magazines.	It is evening and a Mediterranean foreign worker appears at your door saying he is selling magazines.
IV. You are walking down the street alone and must pass a corner where a group of five young men are loitering.	You are walking down the street alone and must pass a corner where a group of five young black men are loitering.	You are walking down the street alone and must pass a corner where a group of five young Mediterranean foreign workers are loitering.
V. Your best friend has just become engaged.	Your best friend has just become engaged to a black person.	Your best friend has just become engaged to a Mediterranean foreign worker.
VI. You are stopped for speeding by a policeman.	You are stopped for speeding by a black policeman.	You are stopped for speeding by a policeman who is a Mediterranean foreign worker.
VII. A new person joins your social group.	A new black person joins your social group.	A Mediterranean foreign worker joins your social group.
VIII. You see a youngster steal something in a dimestore.	You see a black youngster steal something in a dimestore.	You see the child of a Mediterranean foreign worker steal something in a dimestore.
IX. Some students on campus stage a demonstration.	Some black students on campus stage a demonstration.	Some Mediterranean guest students stage a demonstration.
X. You get on a bus and you are the only person who has to stand.	You get on a bus that has all black people aboard and you are the only person who has to stand.	You get on a bus that has all Mediterranean foreign workers aboard and you are the only person who has to stand.

* The Situational Attitude Scale is copyrighted and available from the Cultural Study Center, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland 20742, U.S.A.

TABLE 2

Means, Standard Deviations and *F* Values for Forms A, B, and C*

ITEM NO.	SITUATIONS† BIPOLAR ADJECTIVE DIMENSION	FORM A (*N*=94) MEAN	FORM A (*N*=94) S.D.	FORM B (*N*=90) MEAN	FORM B (*N*=90) S.D.	FORM C (*N*=90) MEAN	FORM C (*N*=90) S.D.	*F* VALUES‡ FORM A TO B	*F* VALUES‡ FORM A TO C	*F* VALUES‡ FORM B TO C
	I. NEW FAMILY NEXT DOOR									
1	good-bad	1.30	0.96	1.27	1.05	1.57	0.96	0.04	3.60	4.01
2	safe-unsafe	1.64	1.00	0.92	0.97	1.39	0.97	24.08	2.94	10.39
3	angry-not angry	3.42	0.98	3.62	0.84	3.23	1.11	2.37	1.39	6.99
4	friendly-unfriendly	0.88	0.90	0.74	0.91	0.88	0.99	1.08	0.00	0.89
5	sympathetic-not sympathetic	1.28	0.98	1.06	0.90	1.13	1.00	2.53	0.97	0.30
6	nervous-calm	2.96	1.15	3.28	1.04	3.00	1.07	3.91	0.07	3.12
7	happy-sad	1.56	0.85	1.60	0.75	1.81	0.78	0.09	4.23	3.45
8	objectionable-acceptable	3.36	0.93	3.61	0.75	3.32	0.93	4.03	0.08	5.26
9	desirable-undesirable	1.62	0.95	1.49	0.89	1.70	0.99	0.89	0.34	2.27
10.	suspicious-trusting	2.57	1.16	3.06	0.95	2.58	1.02	9.42	0.00	10.59
	II. MAN RAPED WOMAN									
11	affection-disgust	3.16	0.88	3.24	0.87	3.04	0.99	0.43	0.69	2.08
12	relish-repulsion	3.21	0.96	3.39	0.82	3.21	0.92	1.79	0.00	1.88
13	happy-sad	2.85	0.94	3.08	0.86	3.01	0.98	2.90	1.28	0.24
14	friendly-hostile	2.78	0.88	2.62	1.00	2.53	1.02	1.24	3.01	0.35
15	uninvolved-involved	2.09	1.16	1.98	1.38	2.11	1.33	0.33	0.02	0.44
16	hope-hopelessness	2.17	0.96	2.18	0.98	1.98	0.85	0.00	2.08	2.15
17	aloof-outraged	1.17	1.12	1.21	1.07	1.54	1.09	0.06	5.24	4.29
18	injure-kill	1.89	0.73	1.96	0.65	1.81	0.60	0.37	0.71	2.40
19	safe-fearful	1.83	0.99	1.82	1.00	1.98	0.72	0.00	1.34	1.44
20	empathetic-can't understand	1.79	1.19	1.86	1.06	1.66	1.04	0.17	0.64	1.64
	III. MAN SELLING MAGAZINES									
21	relaxed-startled	1.13	1.26	0.80	1.00	0.74	1.02	3.79	5.09	0.14
22	receptive-cautious	2.36	1.38	1.64	1.34	1.67	1.38	12.80	11.63	0.01
23	excited-unexcited	2.99	1.01	3.38	0.87	3.41	0.87	7.79	9.14	0.07
24	glad-angered	2.17	0.79	1.89	0.73	2.02	0.56	6.36	2.15	1.90
25	pleased-annoyed	2.45	1.03	2.17	1.05	2.28	0.92	3.32	1.36	0.57
26	indifferent-suspicious	1.92	1.34	1.28	1.15	1.39	1.22	11.90	7.75	0.40
27	tolerable-intolerable	1.59	1.07	0.97	1.03	1.00	1.01	15.87	14.56	0.05
28	afraid-secure	2.88	0.98	3.09	0.92	2.96	1.15	2.15	0.21	0.74
29	friend-enemy	1.90	0.87	1.56	0.85	1.54	0.86	7.57	7.94	0.01
30	unprotected-protected	2.64	1.05	2.88	0.95	2.72	0.97	2.65	0.32	1.18

* Scale A to E (Numerical equivalent, 0 to 4).
† See Table 1 for complete situation.
‡ All *F* values larger than 4.66 are significant beyond .10 (Sheffé).

TABLE 2

Means, Standard Deviations and *F* Values for Forms A, B, and C*
(Continued)

ITEM NO.	SITUATIONS† BIPOLAR ADJECTIVE DIMENSION	FORM A (*N*=94) MEAN	S.D.	FORM B (*N*=90) MEAN	S.D.	FORM C (*N*=90) MEAN	S.D.	*F* VALUES‡ FORM A TO B	FORM A TO C	FORM B TO C
	IV. CORNER OF LOITERING MEN									
31	relaxed-tensed	2.31	1.29	1.71	1.42	1.30	1.22	8.98	29.66	4.35
32	pleased-angered	2.01	0.87	1.57	0.85	1.67	0.73	12.21	8.32	0.72
33	superior-inferior	2.12	0.88	2.24	0.68	1.96	0.69	1.21	1.92	8.11
34	smarter-dumber	1.65	0.90	1.78	0.49	1.70	0.61	1.43	0.20	0.89
35	whiter-blacker	1.43	1.00	1.99	1.04	1.98	0.99	13.98	14.11	0.01
36	aggressive-passive	2.48	1.28	2.91	1.17	2.88	1.16	5.74	4.92	0.04
37	safe-unsafe	2.21	1.26	1.87	1.15	1.38	1.17	3.77	21.70	7.99
38	friendly-unfriendly	1.63	0.95	1.31	0.98	1.21	1.00	4.95	8.40	0.46
39	excited-unexcited	2.25	1.20	2.73	1.04	2.89	1.24	8.73	12.85	0.83
40	trivial-important	1.80	0.99	1.79	0.84	1.74	0.84	0.00	0.16	0.13
	V. FRIEND BECOMES ENGAGED									
41	aggressive-passive	2.38	1.14	3.13	1.04	2.81	1.11	21.75	6.67	4.03
42	happy-sad	1.00	1.13	0.93	0.97	1.41	1.02	0.18	6.74	10.43
43	tolerable-intolerable	0.81	1.09	0.46	0.86	0.73	0.96	5.89	0.25	4.18
44	complimented-insulted	1.88	0.60	1.82	0.61	2.03	0.44	0.46	3.74	7.13
45	angered-overjoyed	2.52	0.90	2.56	0.85	2.19	0.70	0.07	7.75	9.97
46	secure-fearful	1.42	1.06	1.00	0.99	1.34	1.07	7.47	0.20	4.99
47	hopeful-hopeless	1.39	1.06	0.98	0.97	1.33	1.06	7.68	0.15	5.51
48	excited-unexcited	2.82	1.19	3.33	1.04	3.03	1.11	9.71	1.59	3.52
49	right-wrong	1.18	1.09	0.83	1.03	1.22	1.12	4.94	0.07	5.88
50	disgusting-pleasing	2.81	0.99	2.73	0.87	2.47	0.80	0.30	6.65	4.59
	VI. STOPPED BY POLICEMAN									
51	calm-nervous	2.63	1.37	2.17	1.55	1.80	1.46	4.58	15.82	2.67
52	trusting-suspicious	2.26	1.20	1.60	1.24	1.92	1.37	13.24	3.09	2.74
53	afraid-safe	1.77	1.13	2.10	1.18	2.30	1.25	3.84	9.26	1.22
54	friendly-unfriendly	1.34	1.27	1.16	1.12	1.27	1.19	1.10	0.17	0.42
55	tolerant-intolerant	1.40	1.17	1.12	1.17	1.32	1.13	2.68	0.23	1.36
56	bitter-pleasant	2.36	1.20	2.17	1.19	2.16	1.14	1.22	1.43	0.00
57	cooperative-uncooperative	1.21	1.18	1.09	1.21	1.10	1.26	0.50	0.39	0.00
58	acceptive-belligerent	1.29	1.16	1.29	1.14	1.27	1.14	0.00	0.02	0.02
59	inferior-superior	1.69	0.98	1.87	0.88	1.89	0.93	1.62	1.95	0.03
60	smarter-dumber	1.60	0.86	1.87	0.72	1.66	0.78	5.34	0.24	3.54

* Scale A to E (Numerical equivalent, 0 to 4).
† See Table 1 for complete situation.
‡ All *F* values larger than 4.66 are significant beyond .10 (Sheffé).

TABLE 2

Means, Standard Deviations and *F* Values for Forms A, B, and C*
(Continued)

ITEM NO.	SITUATIONS† BIPOLAR ADJECTIVE DIMENSION	FORM A (*N*=94) MEAN	S.D.	FORM B (*N*=90) MEAN	S.D.	FORM C (*N*=90) MEAN	S.D.	*F* VALUES‡ FORM A TO B	FORM A TO C	FORM B TO C
	VII. PERSON JOINS SOCIAL GROUP									
61	warm-cold	1.42	0.93	1.16	1.09	1.42	0.97	3.02	0.00	3.00
62	sad-happy	2.83	0.86	2.84	0.96	2.66	0.84	0.01	1.93	1.98
63	superior-inferior	1.82	0.64	2.06	0.55	1.84	0.39	7.23	0.10	8.81
64	threatened-neutral	2.96	1.15	3.43	0.98	3.19	1.02	9.11	2.10	2.69
65	pleased-displeased	1.55	0.96	1.57	0.91	1.60	0.80	0.01	0.13	0.07
66	understanding-indifferent	1.25	0.96	1.52	1.39	1.43	1.41	2.50	1.14	0.18
67	suspicious-trusting	2.57	0.95	3.08	0.93	2.76	1.11	13.30	1.43	4.49
68	disappointed-elated	2.54	0.81	2.51	0.80	2.29	0.71	0.07	5.09	3.92
69	favorable-unfavorable	0.95	0.96	0.67	0.94	0.92	1.00	4.04	0.03	3.14
70	uncomfortable-comfortable	2.55	1.02	2.92	1.00	2.72	0.98	6.14	1.30	1.84
	VIII. YOUNGSTER STEALS									
71	surprising-not surprising	2.66	1.46	2.04	1.21	2.33	1.32	9.69	2.54	2.36
72	sad-happy	1.31	1.00	1.33	1.15	1.28	0.91	0.03	0.05	0.13
73	disinterested-interested	2.60	1.25	1.94	1.38	1.89	1.43	11.33	12.77	0.07
74	close-distant	1.53	1.31	1.80	1.35	2.07	1.48	1.87	6.78	1.60
75	understandable-baffling	1.34	1.16	1.43	1.12	1.42	1.15	0.31	0.23	0.00
76	responsible-not responsible	2.25	1.28	2.07	1.23	1.91	1.12	0.93	3.55	0.79
77	concerned-unconcerned	1.43	1.25	1.76	1.23	2.02	1.36	3.26	9.64	1.91
78	sympathy-indifference	1.76	1.23	1.79	1.24	2.11	1.47	0.03	3.17	2.52
79	expected-unexpected	1.55	1.14	2.29	1.07	2.12	0.95	20.25	13.49	1.22
80	hopeful-hopeless	1.95	1.00	1.83	0.93	1.98	0.89	0.64	0.05	1.14
	IX. CAMPUS DEMONSTRATION									
81	bad-good	2.70	1.23	3.01	0.98	2.77	1.15	3.56	0.14	2.36
82	understanding-indifferent	1.14	1.32	1.18	1.35	1.28	1.34	0.04	0.51	0.25
83	suspicious-trusting	2.37	1.09	2.74	0.91	2.46	1.16	6.33	0.25	3.46
84	safe-unsafe	1.45	1.02	1.46	1.07	1.44	1.07	0.00	0.00	0.01
85	disturbed-undisturbed	2.17	1.08	2.63	1.07	2.42	1.08	8.54	2.49	1.74
86	justified-unjustified	1.28	1.04	1.13	0.93	1.67	1.10	0.97	6.10	12.36
87	tense-calm	2.43	1.19	2.72	1.27	2.69	1.22	2.68	2.21	0.03
88	hate-love	2.38	0.82	2.37	0.76	2.29	0.71	0.02	0.69	0.51
89	wrong-right	2.69	1.04	2.72	0.95	2.37	1.09	0.04	4.31	5.48
90	humorous-serious	2.42	1.11	2.80	1.11	2.61	1.06	5.51	1.50	1.36

* Scale A to E (Numerical equivalent, 0 to 4).
† See Table 1 for complete situation.
‡ All *F* values larger than 4.66 are significant beyond .10 (Sheffé).

TABLE 2

Means, Standard Deviations and *F* Values for Forms A, B, and C*
(Continued)

ITEM NO.	SITUATIONS† BIPOLAR ADJECTIVE DIMENSION	FORM A (*N*=94) MEAN	S.D.	FORM B (*N*=90) MEAN	S.D.	FORM C (*N*=90) MEAN	S.D.	*F* VALUES‡ FORM A TO B	FORM A TO C	FORM B TO C
	X. ONLY PERSON STANDING									
91	fearful-secure	2.87	1.13	2.67	1.14	2.81	1.12	1.51	0.14	0.73
92	tolerable-intolerable	0.94	1.13	0.93	1.16	0.86	1.06	0.00	0.25	0.22
93	hostile-indifferent	3.33	0.97	3.24	1.03	3.30	1.08	0.34	0.04	0.13
94	important-trivial	2.79	1.14	2.86	1.12	2.83	1.05	0.17	0.08	0.02
95	conspicuous-inconspicuous	2.35	1.33	2.07	1.57	2.20	1.44	1.76	0.55	0.35
96	calm-anxious	0.86	1.11	0.77	1.14	0.97	1.08	0.33	0.42	1.46
97	indignant-understanding	3.11	1.04	2.92	1.12	2.88	0.93	1.33	2.45	0.08
98	comfortable-uncomfortable	1.57	1.20	1.50	1.18	1.57	1.02	0.18	0.00	0.16
99	hate-love	2.32	0.77	2.23	0.74	2.21	0.65	0.60	1.07	0.05
100	not resentful-resentful	0.93	1.12	0.73	0.99	0.86	1.11	1.52	0.18	0.61

* Scale A to E (Numerical equivalent, 0 to 4).
† See Table 1 for complete situation.
‡ All *F* values larger than 4.66 are significant beyond .10 (Sheffé).

END

DEPT.OF HEALTH
EDUCATION AND
WELFARE

U.S. OFFICE OF
EDUCATION
ERIC
DATE FILMED

11 1 72